DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 395 FL 016 793

AUTHOR Wali, Kashi
TITLE LF Movement: A Problem for Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, Urbana, IL, May 29-31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Deep Structure; Grammar; *Kashmiri; *Linguistic Theory; *Marathi; Phrase Structure; *Questioning Techniques; *Semantics; *Sentence Structure; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Surface Structure; Syntax; Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

It is proposed that LF-movement in in-situ questions is not adequate to express the scope distinctions basic to the semantic interpretations of the direct and indirect question dichotomy in Marathi and Kashmiri, because this question type is more constrained in these languages than in languages like Chinese and Japanese. This theory is illustrated in a structural analysis of examples from Chinese, English, Marathi, and Kashmiri. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED283395

# LF Movement: A Problem for Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri

Kashi Wali

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Wali

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 016 793

Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL May 29-31, 1986).



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LF Movement: A problem for Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri

In-Situ Questions in languages like Chinese and Japanese have been simulated as having a movement at LF level. The LF movement enables one to express the proper narrow and wide scope distinctions which are basic to the semantic interpretations of the direct & indirect question dichotomy. The object of this paper is to show that LF movement is not adequate to express the scope distinctions in Marathi and Kashmiri. The in-situ questions in these languages are much more constrained than those in Chinese and Japanese. The Marathi and Kashmiri sentences in (1) for example are interpreted as having only the narrow scope while those in (2) are ungrammatical.

1.a.(M). Minilaa maahiit aahe [ki [Mohanni kaay vaacla]]].
b.(K). Minaai čhi khabar [ki [Mohnan k'ah por]]]
knows that what read

(i) 'Mina knows what Mohan read.'
(ii) '*What does Minaa know that Mohan read?' (o.k.in English)

2.a.(M). *Minilaa vaaṭta [ki [kooṇi pustak vaacla]]]
b.(K). *Minaai čhi baasaan [ki [kem̐ par kitaab]]]
believes that who read book
(i) '*Minaa believes who read the book.'
(ii) '*Who does Minaa believe read the book?' (o.k. in English)

In contrast in Chinese a sentence parallel to (1) will be ambiguous between a narrow and a wide scope interpretation and the one in (2) will have an unambiguous wide scope as in (3) & (4).

(3). (Ch). [Zhangsan zhidao [shei mai-le shu]]
know who bought books

(i) 'Zangsan knows who bought the books.'
(ii) 'Who does Zangsan know bought the books?'

S-structure: [NP knows [....WH.....]
LF-Structure: (i) [NP knows [WH[....e...]
(ii) [WH[ NP knows [....e...]

(4).(Ch). [Zhangsan xiangxin [shei mai-le shu]]
believe who bought books

(i) '*Zangsan believes who bought the books'
(ii) 'Who does Zangsan believe bought the books?'

S-structure: [NP believes [....WH...]
LF-structure:(i)*[NP believes [WH[....e...]
(ii)[WH [NP believes [....e....] (Huang,diss.)

A simulated LF movement correctly represents the Chinese data but is inadequate to predict the WH scope in Marathi and Kashmiri. What then are the conditions that constrain the WH sope in these languages? I argue that the scope interpretations in these languages are conditioned by such factors as factivity, a connectedness condition dependent upon the branching direction accompanied by a switch in the complementiser in Marathi and by a very interesting reconstruction of the WH morpheme in the matrix clause in Kashmiri which creats a connecting path to reach the operator. The discussion will be confined to the tense clauses in these languages.

Consider first the narrow scope associated with the indirect questions. Within the GB framework the subcategorisation feature [+ WH] on the COMP node of each verb determines its choice of indirect question. 'Believe' for example is subcategorised for [-WH] while 'wonder' is subcategorised for [+WH]. The former excludes the indirect questions while the latter necessarily requires it as shown in (5&6).

(5).* Mary believes who John likes.
(6) I wonder who John likes/ *I wonder John likes Mary.

The lexical subcategorisation of the individual verbs for indirect questions is almost universal and has been recently formalised as an LF filter by Lasnik & Saito as in (7).

Narrow scope LF Filter: (Lasnik & Saito)

(7).a. A [+WH] COMP must have a [+WH] head. (ask, wonder,....)
b. A [-WH] COMP must not have a [+WH] head. (Believe,regret...)

The [WH] subcategorisation though it correctly predicts the association of individual verbs with the indirect question it misses a semantic generalisation. It is not quite clear for example that the verbs that optionally allow indirect questions mostly belong to the factive class while those that exclude it are mostly nonfactive or what has been recently termed as propositionals by Peterson and Wali. The lexical [WH] subcategorisation comes out as an idiosyncratic property of each verb. It has no way of capturing the implicit semantic generalisation on the factivity scale. I suggest instead that the verbs carry the sematic feature bundle [$\pm$ Factive, $\pm$Propositional] which gives a better classification and appears to be syntacticaly and semanticaly relevant in Marathi and Kashmiri for both direct and indirect questions as I will show. These features classify the verbs as in (8).

(8). Verb chart: F:Factive P:Propositional

| +F | +F | -F | -F |
|---|---|---|---|
| -P | +P | +P | -P |
| know | regret | believe | tell |
| forget | sad | seem | say |
| realise | | appear | |
| discover | | true | |

Notice that the verbs that exclude the indirect questions belong to the `regret' and `believe' category both of which share the feature [+P]. The L&S filter (7) can now be tentaviely replaced by a much more satisfactory schema such as (9). It may have to be reformulated again if we adopt Kayne's analysis.

(9). [+P] verbs must not have a [+WH] in their COMP. (LF filter)

The inquisitive verbs like `wonder' & `ask' that necessarily take the indirect questions will need one more feature and can easily be accomodated in this schema and a corresponding filter can be set up to indicate that they require a [+WH]COMP. Filter (9) predicts that emotive factive `regret' and the propositional `believe' will exclude indirect questions. See (3) & (10).

(10).a.M. * Miraalaa du'kkh vaaṭṭa ki Mohanni koṇaalaa pustak dila.
b.K. * Miraai ċhi afsuus ki Mohanan kamis d'ut kitaab
Miraa regrets that Mohan who gave book

'*Mira regrets who Mohan gave the book to.'

Consider now the wide scope interpretation associated with the direct questions in the embedded tense clauses. In Marathi the objectual tns. clause can be either postposed to the right or preposed to the left though it basically occurs in the center since Marathi is an SOV language. The interesting facet of Marathi is that the scope interpretations are dependent on the position of the clause. The postposed right branching `ki' clauses never allow a widescope as shown in (11).

M.(11). a. Minilaa (i) maahiit aahe ki Lili-ni Ravilaa kaay dila.
knows that Ravi-to what gave
(ii) vaatta
believes
(iii) vaaiit vaatta
regrets
Mini (iv) mhaṇate
says

Expected LF interpretation [WH[NP V [ki[ ...e...] is not available for (11).

The absence of the wide scope in the `ki' clause is surprising

under LF movement. The exclusion of the wide scope can not be allocated to any semantic constraint since it is allowed in most languages. The explanation now must be sought in the syntactic component in some language specific terms. Lexical ECP, the principle that is most relevant at the LF level for the constraint on WH movement appears to be of no avail here. In (11) lexical ECP will always be preserved irrespective of bounding nodes. Preservation of the lexical ECP is then not sufficient to achieve the wide scope in Marathi. Antecedent ECP, the next available solution under LF movement requires for its violation that the the antecedent and the trace be not within the same maximal projection. If we assume that the WH movement is successive cyclic then again there will be no ECP violation since both the original and the intermediate trace are antecedent governed in a proper fashion as in (12a). If the movement is long distance then we do get antecedent ECP violation since now the original trace and its antecedent are not in the same maximal projection as in (12b).

12.a. Successive cyclic movement: [WH[NP V[e ki[NP...e..V]]]
b. Long distance movement : [WH[NP...V[ki [NP...e..V]]]

This move correctly predicts the prohibition on the wide scope in (11). The Wh-in-situ in Marathi and as I will show shortly in Kashmiri thus sharply contrasts with the one in Chinese and Japanese. In the latter WH subject object complements also move in one single step however lexical ECP supercedes antecedent ECP violations as evidenced in (3&4). The lexically governed complements can freely move at LF disregarding the antcedent ECP violations. It distinguishes subject and object complements from the adjuncts in complement structures and even allows their extraction from complex NP as noted in Lasnik and Saito. The adjuncts in these languages have been argued to move in a sucesssive cyclic fashion, they obey the antecedent ECP and the sentence is ungrammatical only if the intermediate trace and its antecedent are not within the same maximal projection as in a complex NP situation. In contrast in Marathi and Kashmiri it is the antecedent ECP that takes precedence engulfing the adjuncts as well as the lexical complements. Notice that the LF movement analysis when applied to Marathi and Kashmiri reduces lexical ECP to near vacuity and brings the antecedent ECP a step closer to subjecency though they are not equivalent. The latter operates at S-structure and the WH movement is successive cyclic across the board. This assumption seems to hold in Marathi with respect to the relative clause which requires a movement of the embedded NP in order to distinguish between speaker subject discription as shown in (13).

(13) M.a. ji mulgi$_i$ Minilaa maahiit aahe [t$_i$ ki [ t$_i$ ghari geli] ti mulgi.

wh girl Mini knows that home went that girl
'The girl that Mini knows t went home...'

An attractive alternative to LF movement is to posit a Question operator scoping the matrix clause and to assume that the connection between the operator and the WH phrase is decided by the word order dependent Connectedness Condition as suggested in Kayne. In this framwork the exclusion of the wide scope follows from the fact that in an SOV language the verb is not a cannonical governer of the S' that branches to the right. The ability of the operator to reach the WH phrase in the ki' clause is foiled because the maximal S' is to the right of its cannonical governer, namely the verbs `know, believe, regret, & say' while the WH phrase is to the left of its cannonical governer as shown in (14). in its schematic form.

(14). [Q[NP.. knows/believes,etc.[s'[ki s[....WH..V]]]
(Matrix V S' mismatches embedded WH V order).

I mentioned above that Kashmiri is an SVO language. Kayne's condition thus predicts that the `ki' clauses in Kashmiri should be accessible for wide scope. Kashmiri however is like Marathi. The Kashmiri `ki' clause is also a barrier for wide scope as exemplified in (15).

15.K. Miraai čhi pataa ki Mohanan ka mis dits kitaab.
know that Mohan who gave book
baasaan
believe
afsuus
regret
Miran von
said

Expected wide scope interpretation at LF is not available in (15)

The expected wide scope interpretation is not possible in Kashmiri `ki' clause either. An interesting facet of Kashmiri is it reverts to an SOV order in its question clause. It does not allow the Question word to follow the verb as shown by the ungrammatical (16)a.

16.K.a. *Raajan dits Miraai k'ah? (S V WH Order)
gave what
b. Raajan k'ah d'ut Miraai? (S WH V Order)
what gave
'What did Raj give to Mira?'

The word order switch now brings it in line with the SOV pattern and again the cannonical government relations between the matrix V and the maximal projection S' do not match those between the WH nominal and the verb within S' and the operator fails to bind the WH nominal. For binding in the right branching structure it is necessary that the lexical

government be also on the right side. Notice that it is the S-structure position of the WH phrase that is relevant for the connectedness to operate. Under LF movement we will again have to resort to long distance movement and violation of antecedent ECP. It does not provide any motivation for the local preverbal WH movement to which I return later.

Consider now the basic preverbal as well as the preposed position of the objectual clause. In Marathi both the positions allow the wide scope just in case the verb belongs to the non factive category. The factive verbs again resist the wide scope interpretation as shown below.

17.M.a. Minilaa [Lilini Ravilaa kaay dila]asa] vaaṭta.
what gave that believe

b. Lilini Ravilaa kaay dila asa Minilaa vaaṭta.
what gave that believes

'What does Mini believe Lili gave to Ravi?'

S-structure (a): [NP [...WH...]asa]believe]]] (Center embedding)
S-Structure (b): [[....WH...]asa][NP believes]. (Preposed position)

LF interpretation of (17a&b) : [WH [NP believe [NP gave t to NP]]].

18.M.a. Minilaa [Lilini Ravilaa kaay dila]te] maahiit aahe
what gave that knows

b. [Lilini Ravilaa kaay dila] te] Minilaa maahiit aahe.
what gave knows

'*What does Mini know that Lili gave t to Ravi?'

S-structure (a): [NP [...WH..]te]knows] (Center S)
S-structure (b): [[....WH...]te][NP knows] (Preposed S)

LF interpretation of (18a&b): *[WH[NP knows[NP gave e to NP]

Consider first the branching dependent analysis. The cannonical government condition predicts that the left branching structures create proper paths in the SOV language and the operators can connect with the WH. This prediction is fulfilled in (17) and the wide scope interpretation becomes available. The left branching condion is fulfilled in (18) also, but the operator has failed to bind the WH as predicted. I suggest that the crucial distinction here again goes back to the factivity which in Marathi is reflected in the structure of the factive clause itself. I argue that there is a node [+N] in the matrix clause accompaning the factive verbs which does not cannonically govern the preposed as well as postposed S' thus constraining the WH scope within S' itself. The arguments for the factive S' being governed by a

[+N] come from the fact that only factive verbs are accompanied by an optional nominal `hi gosta' (this story) in both preposed and postposed clauses while this is not allowed with the non factive verbs as shown in (19&20).

M. 19. a. Minilaa (hi goṣṭa/he) maahiit aahe ki koṇ ghari gela.
(this story/this) knows that who home went

b. koṇ ghari gela (hi goṣṭa/he/te) Minilaa maahiit aahe
who home went this story/this/that Mini knows.

M. 20.a. Minilaa (*hi gosta/*he/asa) vaaṭta ki Lili ghari geli.
so feels that Lili home went

b. Lili ghari geli (*hi gosta/*he/asa Minilaa vaatta.
Lili home went so M. feels

21. Accompaning complementisers in preverbal clauses:

| Factives | Propositionals |
|---|---|
| te (that), *asa | *te, asa (so) |

Notice that the [+N] node accompaning the preposed clauses with `know' is `te' a definite pronominal while the one with believe clause is `asa' which may be glossed as `so'. The two can not be switched over. The LF movement assumption will again have to bring in antecedent ECP for the `know' type verbs while the `believe' verbs can have a wide scope since antecedent ECP is not violated. Under Kayne's analysis the preverbal right branching structure satisfies the Connectedness Condition in propositionals but not in the factives since in the latter the maximal projection has a [+N] governer. That the distinction is related to the factivity accompanied by a [+N] node is reflected in the verbs of regret class which have both the factive and the propositional features. When 'regret' is accompanied by 'te' the wide scope is blocked but there is no such blocking when the accompanining node is 'mhanuun'.

22.M.a.Lilini kooṇaalaa pustak dila *hyaaca/mhaṇuun tulaa duukkha vaaṭta
who-to book gave that/so you regret

'Who do you regret that Lili gave a book to?' (possible with 'mhanuun' only)

The duality of the regret clause supports the argument that it is propositionality associated with the [-N] node that controls the wide scope.

Returning to Kashmiri we note that it does not allow the objectual tensed clause to be positioned between the subject and the verb as in Marathi (17a). It does allow the clauses to be preposed but their acceptibility is at best marginal. The preposed factive clause is accepted more readily than the

preposed propositional clause. The preposed factive as well as propositional clause again do not allow the wide scope interpretation. The WH in the factive clause has only the narrow scope interpretation while the non factive clause is ungrammatical like its 'ki' counterpart. It does not have a wide scope interpretation as in the corresponding Marathi clause.

23.K.a. Raajan Šilas k'ah d'ut yi/ti a:s Miraai khabar.
what gave that knows
'Miraa knows what Raj gave to Sila.'
*What does Mira know that Raj gave to Šila?' (o.k. in Eng.)

b. *Raajan Šilaai k'ah d'ut Miraai chi baasaan?
what give believes
'*What does Mira believe Raj gave to Shila?' (o.k. in English)

LF interpretation '[WH[[..e..] yi/ti][NP knows/believes]' is not available.

The containment of the scope in the factive clauses again appears to arise from the fact that these clauses are governed by a [+N] node just as they are in Marathi. This node is not a proper cannnonical governer and blocks the WH connection with the Q operator.. The claim is substantiated by the fact that the factive clause can be expanded by 'yi kath/yi' 'this story/this' and that with the preposed WH clauses it employs a special complementiser 'ti' just as in Marathi factive clauses in (17).

24.K. a. Raajan Silas k'ah d'ut yi kath/yi/ti a:s Miraai khabar.
what gave this story/this/that Mira knows.
'Miraa knows what Raj gave to Shila'

b.[Q[[...WH....] +N] [NP knows].

The non factive verbs have no such acompaning nominal nodes and since there is already a verb final structure in the WH clause we expect the wide scope interpretation to be a possibility from the left branching structure. However this prediction is not fulfilled. Instead the wide scope is achieved by the employment of a question particle in the main clause of the 'ki' complement as shown in (25).

25.K.a. Mohanas k'ah chu baasaan (ki) Miraa kamis nish bihat.
what believes that who near sit
'Who does Mohan believe Mira is sitting near?'

S-structure: [...WH...believe[ki[...wh....V]]]

LF: [Q[...WH..believe[ki[...WH...V]]]

The duplicated WH particle is not a 'yes/no' question morpheme. In Kashmiri these are formed by adding a suffix

to the verb itself. The matrix WH belongs to the regular WH family except here it has no denotating function. It is a neutral entity which helps the embedded WH to achieve wide scope.

The attainment of the wide scope by the employment of a question particle in the matrix leaving the embedded WH intact is unusual and very different than achieving it through LF movement as found in Chinese, or Japanese or through natural left branching as in Marathi. Kashmiri employs an SOV structure in its question clauses. The language only marginally permits the preposed left branching structures in its tensed clauses and thus attaining wide scope through left branching is discarded. Its right branching ki' clause does not permit WH to have a wide scope at LF. This near catch 22 situation is overidden by means of a novel mechanism which allows it to build a connecting path to the main operator. Under Kayne's Connectedness Condition this does not come as a surprise. The g-projection sets when subsumed under a proper node and having proper cannonical government relations can establish a contact between the operator and the WH position. The Connectedness Condition is not fulfilled in the 'ki' clause because the main verb does not cannonically govern S'. Creation of a preverbal WH elelment creats the right cannonical government relation. The WH V pair in the matrix now matches the WH V pair in the embedded clause. The new matching condition supercedes the earlier barrier and escapes the violation.

(26).Cannonical government pairs:
Before the insertion of matrix WH: [Q [..*V [S'[...WH V]
After the insertion of matrix WH: [Q [.. WH V [S'[..WH V]

Recall that a special and rather rare feature of this Himalayan language is that it does not move its WH in comp at S-structure like English, Polish & Vata which have been taken as a paradigm of S-structure WH movement. The movement is only to a preverbal position. The movement moreover is not confined to the root clauses and can not be taken as a local focus type movement. For in Kashmiri in certain wishing verbs WH is extracted from its embedded ki' clause and positioned in the matrix clause to indicate wide scope as in (27).

(27).K. Miraa ka mis čhi yatshaan [ki tsu gotsh anun t]]].
who want that he should bring
'Who does Mira want that he should bring?'

In (27) WH has moved specifically to a matrix preverbal position. The movement has taken place at S-structure. Notice that the cannonical government relations in (27) are exactly similar to those in (25). Only difference is (27) resorts to S-structure movement while (25) creats a new WH. Both constructions position the WH before the matrix verb. Both suggest that in order to achieve scope it is not necessary to move WH in COMP

either at S-structure or at LF. The same effect is achieved through Connectedness conditions that relate an operator to its target. It is not quite clear how the LF movement can handle the local as well as cross clause Kashmiri WH movement as in (15 & 27). It is a rare wH movement and is unlike the one in English and Polish where the WH moves in the COMP which happens to coincide with the scope position at S-structure and the traces obey either the lexical or the antecedent ECP. The movement can not be pushed into PF component because of (27). I will not go into the details of this complexity here except to point out that it will require a modification in the S-structure constraints that control the S-structure movement. This is best exemplified by Lasnik and Saito's Filter (13) noted here in (28).

28. L&S Filter 13: *COMP [+WH] unless it contains a [+WH] element at S-structure.

The filter has been set up for inquisitive verbs like 'wonder & guess' and is supposed to hold in all and only those languages that have syntactic WH movement. It helps to exclude such sentences as '*What do you wonder that John bought. L&S state that (13) is not an independent parameter but instead is implicationally connected to a more basic parameter, that of having or not having syntactic WH movement. In order to exclude Kashmiri from being subjected to (13) we will have to distinguish between movement to the COMP position and quasi syntactic movements as in Kashmiri.

---

References:

Aoun, J., N. Hornstein, D. Sportiche. (1981) Some Aspects of Wide Scope Quantification. Journal of Linguistic Reserch 1:69-96.

Huang, C.T.J. (1982) Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar. M.I.T. Dissertation.

Kayne, R. (1983) Connectedness. LI 14: 223-49.

Lasnik, H. & M. Saito. (1984) On The Nature of Proper Government. LI 15: 235-289.

Peterson P. & K. Wali. (1985) Event. LA 15 1-18.

(I am thankful to Peter Hook for pointing out to me that there is an S-Structure extraction in certain Kashmiri verbs).